

## REMARKS

The specification has been changed to correct a mistake in hydrophilic/hydrophobic. It is obvious that a high wet contact angle shows the hydrophobic character of the membrane (see also in the specification at page 8, lines 13-14).

Claims 1-8 have been rejected as unpatentable over Mir (US 4,353,715) in view of Masson (US 6,010,833).

As far as it applies to the claims presently amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the hydrophilic ultrafiltration membrane is made using acrylonitrile polymers or copolymers, as described in the specification at page 3, lines 11-12 and as especially shown by the examples in the specification. On page 6 of the office action, the examiner acknowledges that examples establish that acrylonitrile membranes "performed better". Thus, the present claims are commensurate in scope with the showing and are therefore allowable.

Mir (715) teaches the use of membranes made using cellulose acetate or other polymeric material adapted (col 2 lines 19-20) in a method of recycling wash water from paint booths containing carbon particles.

Masson (833) teaches in its examples the use of polyamide membranes (Filmtec®) in a method for recycling wash-water from photographic films.

The results in Tables III to V in the specification show unexpectedly that acrylonitrile copolymer based hydrophilic ultrafiltration membranes are particularly efficient and enable the complete removal of carbon particles to be obtained with a relatively low cut-off.

Neither Mir nor Masson teaches the specific choice of acrylonitrile hydrophilic membranes having an electrically charged membrane surface in order to remove carbon particles from wash-water resulting from the treatment of a cine film.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that none of the references, taken alone or in combination, disclose or make obvious the claimed invention.

Claim 9 has been rejected as unpatentable over Mir (US 4,353,715) in view of Masson and Yamada (US 6,277,209). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As Applicant believes that Mir and Masson taken in combination don't disclose the invention, the combination of both with Yamada doesn't disclose the invention of dependent claim 9. In other words, Yamada does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Mir and Masson.

Dependent Claim 10 has been rejected as unpatentable over Mir (US 4,353,715) in view of Masson and Hilgren (US 4,692,251) and Olsen (US 6,315,130). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As Applicant believes that Mir and Masson taken in combination don't disclose the invention, the combination of both with Hilgren and Olsen doesn't disclose the invention. Neither Hilgren nor Olsen cures the deficiencies of the combination.

In view of the foregoing comments, the Applicant believes that the unpatentability rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over all of the cited art is improper. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Early action to that end is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey Hawley  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 27,645

JJH/jpc  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (585) 724-4947  
Facsimile: (585) 724-9657